



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/666,468	09/19/2003	L. Terry Boatman	SOF152/142595 S077-12693	8855
7590	10/25/2004			EXAMINER SWINEHART, EDWIN L
GARY L. BUSH ANDREWS & KURTH L.L.P. 600 TRAVIS, SUITE 4200 HOUSTON, TX 77002			ART UNIT 3617	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 10/25/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 10/666,468	Applicant(s) BOATMAN ET AL.
	Examiner Ed Swinehart	Art Unit 3617
	<i>-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --</i>	
<b>Period for Reply</b>		
<p>A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.</p> <p>- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.</p> <p>- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.</p> <p>- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.</p> <p>- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).</p> <p>Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).</p>		
<b>Status</b>		
<p>1)<input type="checkbox"/> Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.</p> <p>2a)<input type="checkbox"/> This action is <b>FINAL</b>.      2b)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> This action is non-final.</p> <p>3)<input type="checkbox"/> Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i>, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.</p>		
<b>Disposition of Claims</b>		
<p>4)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) <u>1-8</u> is/are pending in the application.</p> <p>4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.</p> <p>5)<input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.</p> <p>6)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) <u>1-8</u> is/are rejected.</p> <p>7)<input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.</p> <p>8)<input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.</p>		
<b>Application Papers</b>		
<p>9)<input type="checkbox"/> The specification is objected to by the Examiner.</p> <p>10)<input type="checkbox"/> The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a)<input type="checkbox"/> accepted or b)<input type="checkbox"/> objected to by the Examiner.</p> <p>    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).</p> <p>    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).</p> <p>11)<input type="checkbox"/> The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.</p>		
<b>Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119</b>		
<p>12)<input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</p> <p>a)<input type="checkbox"/> All    b)<input type="checkbox"/> Some * c)<input type="checkbox"/> None of:</p> <p>    1.<input type="checkbox"/> Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</p> <p>    2.<input type="checkbox"/> Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.</p> <p>    3.<input type="checkbox"/> Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</p>		
<p>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</p>		
<b>Attachment(s)</b>		
<p>1)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</p> <p>2)<input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</p> <p>3)<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____</p>		
<p>4)<input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____</p> <p>5)<input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)</p> <p>6)<input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____</p>		

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claim 6 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Carlsen et al. '553.

Carlsen et al. '553 discloses the claimed invention, specifically, the bearing surface ring is disposed about the turret, and the radial bearing pads are provided as well.

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1,2 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carlsen et al. '553.

Carlsen et al. '553 discloses the claimed invention, with exception that the bearings and bearing surface are in effect reversed from the claimed arrangement. Specifically, the bearing surface ring is affixed to the inside of the moonpool opening, and the radial bearing pads are affixed to the outer side of the turret.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to essentially reverse the mounting of the components of Carlsen et al. '553, such that the bearing surface is affixed to the turret and the bearings affixed to the

moonpool. Such would have provided no unexpected results, and is essentially an obvious design consideration.

Re "in a ring", such fails to define over the general arrangement of components.

Construction of elements from corrosion resistant materials which are known to be in contact with saltwater is considered an obvious design consideration, well within the level of skill of the ordinary routineer working in the art at the time of the invention.

Re claim 4, "low" is a relative term, carrying little weight in the claim.

5. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carlsen et al. '553 as applied to claims 1 and 2 above, and further in view of Stafford.

Carlsen et al. '553 fails to disclose the mounting of the bearings upon a ring.

Stafford teaches the provision of a support ring affixed to each of the turret and moonpool for support of radial bearings.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide an attached supporting ring for support of the bearing pads of Carlsen et al. '553 as taught by Stafford.

Such a combination would have been desirable at the time the invention was made so as to provide increased strength of the assembly.

6. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carlsen et al. in view of Stafford as applied to claim 3 above, and further in view of Pollack '197.

Pollack shows a cylindrical bearing surface **242**, and a plurality of radial bearings secured and arranged about the turret in a ring. Each bearing is mounted upon a removable bracket.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to mount the bearings of Carlsen upon removable brackets as taught by Pollack.

Such a combination would have been desirable at the time the invention was made so as to provide ease in replacement.

7. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carlsen et al. '553.

The thickness of the bearing pads is considered to have been an obvious design consideration, well within the level of skill of the ordinary routineer working in the art at the time of the invention, providing no unexpected results.

8. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pollack '197.

Pollack '197 teaches a bearing assembly as claimed (Fig. 12). The bearing pad 240 can be seen as being retained such that it is prevented from moving vertically in use by clamp 244. The presence of the clamp implies replacability.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to replace the bearing pads of Pollack '197 as needed, as is considered to have been old and well known in the art. Inherently during such replacement, the clamp must be removed, and the bearing pad raised vertically to clear its retaining bracket.

Such a procedure would have been desirable at the time the invention was made so as to provide for replacement of worn parts.

Art Unit: 3617

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ed Swinehart whose telephone number is 703-308-2566. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday 6:30 am to 2:00 pm..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Samuel Morano can be reached on 703-308-0230. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Ed Swinehart  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3617